Case:17-03283-LTS Doc#:16674-1 Filed:05/03/21 Entered:05/03/21 22:33:33 Desc: Exhibit A: Hearing on Motions (Mar. 17 2021) Page 1 of 12

EXHIBIT A

```
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 1
 2
                          DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO
 3
                                         Docket No. 3:17-BK-3283(LTS)
     In Re:
 4
                                         PROMESA Title III
 5
     The Financial Oversight and )
     Management Board for
 6
     Puerto Rico,
                                         (Jointly Administered)
 7
     as representative of
 8
     The Commonwealth of
     Puerto Rico, et al.
                                          March 17, 2021
 9
                     Debtors,
10
11
12
     The Financial Oversight and )
     Management Board for
13
                                   ) Docket No. 3:20-AP-00003(LTS)
     Puerto Rico,
14
     as representative of
15
     The Commonwealth of
     Puerto Rico, et al.
                                          in 3:17-BK-3283(LTS)
16
                     Plaintiff,
17
     V.
18
     Ambac Assurance Corporation,)
19
     et al.
20
                     Defendants.
21
22
2.3
2.4
25
```

```
1
 2
 3
     The Financial Oversight and )
     Management Board for
     Puerto Rico,
                                   ) Docket No. 3:20-AP-00004(LTS)
 4
 5
     as representative of
 6
     The Commonwealth of
     Puerto Rico, et al.
                                          in 3:17-BK-3283(LTS)
 7
                     Plaintiff,
 8
     V.
 9
     Ambac Assurance Corporation,)
10
     et al.
11
                     Defendants.
12
13
     The Financial Oversight and )
14
     Management Board for
     Puerto Rico,
                                   ) Docket No. 3:20-AP-00005(LTS)
15
     as representative of
16
     The Commonwealth of
17
     Puerto Rico, et al.
                                          in 3:17-BK-3283(LTS)
18
                     Plaintiff,
19
     v.
20
     Ambac Assurance Corporation,)
     et al.
21
                     Defendants.
22
2.3
2.4
25
```

1	
2	HEARING ON MOTIONS
3	BEFORE THE HONORABLE U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE JUDITH GAIL DEIN
4	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
5	
6	APPEARANCES:
7	ALL PARTIES APPEARING VIA ZOOM
8	For The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, et al.: Mr. Michael Firestein, PHV Mr. Lary Rappaport, PHV Mr. Colin Kass, PHV
9	
10	MI. COIIII RASS, PRV
11	For Puerto Rico Fiscal Agency and Financial
12	Advisory Authority: Ms. Elizabeth McKeen, PHV Ms. Ashley Pavel, PHV
13	For Financial Guaranty
14	Insurance Company: Mr. Adam Langley, PHV
15	For National Public Finance Guarantee
16	Corporation: Mr. Robert Berezin, PHV
17	For Assured Guaranty Corporation: Mr. William Natbony, PHV
18	
19	For Ambac Assurance Corporation: Ms. Atara Miller, PHV
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	Proceedings recorded by stenography. Transcript produced by CAT.

2.3

MR. FIRESTEIN: From Los Angeles, it's morning, so good morning, Your Honor. Michael Firestein of Proskauer on behalf of the Board, and I'm joined on this call as well by my partners, Lary Rappaport and Colin Kass.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to ask you all before you speak to identify yourselves again for the record to make the transcript easier.

As an opening statement, let me just say I have been through all the papers. There are a lot of papers. I don't see that there's a general prohibition against any specific type of discovery, so I don't think that there is a blanket prohibition against e-mails or against audit-related papers and work materials. So I don't really want to hear that argument. But I do think that the discovery that was authorized is very targeted. And the words used were used carefully in drafting what the allowable discovery is.

So I'm going to ask you to link your argument to the specific request, because I think that's the only way that we can give effect to the very specific order. And I also think it makes sense for us to do it in the order in the papers. So we'll start with PRIFA. We'll finish that, and then we'll move on to the next one. Okay?

All right. Who's going to start?

MS. MILLER: I will, Your Honor. Atara Miller from Milbank, LLP, for the record.

We can identify those, and go back to the Board and go back to AAFAF and make sure that we're very clear that we are not trying to do a forensic audit of everything that's out there. I don't want to do that. I used to do that. I don't want to do that again. We can target this and make it very specific to what we're trying to obtain.

MS. MCKEEN: Your Honor --

2.3

MR. FIRESTEIN: Your Honor, can I make one observation? Can I make one observation? I'm sorry. I just feel compelled to say this.

THE COURT: You need to first identify yourself and then speak.

MR. FIRESTEIN: Michael Firestein of Proskauer for the Board.

We have an understanding with the defendants that if they receive responses or productions, that they would share those productions with us. This is the first I've heard of something that they have apparently received from a third party, documents responsive to this discovery, and I don't know what he's talking about.

And this is not the first instance I've actually had to exchange -- so I want a commitment, if I could implore the Court to have this confirmed, that when they get documents in response to a subpoena, they will send them to us.

THE COURT: I'm assuming that that's the agreement.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Your Honor, we did provide those. MR. LANGLEY: Those are the financial statements for PRIFA. They were sent over, I believe, from Milbank. So we can confirm with Mr. Firestein and make sure that everything is being done above board, but those were provided. I think that's a complete --THE COURT: That's Mr. Langley speaking, by the way. I apologize. MR. LANGLEY: MR. FIRESTEIN: This is Michael Firestein. If they have been, that's fine. I have tried to maintain attention to what we have seen under the circumstances, and I don't recall that. So if that has occurred, then I'll stand corrected on the point, but I don't recall seeing it. And if -- as long as it's the agreement that's going to be provided, that's good enough for me. And I'll take Mr. Langley and everybody else at their word on that point, but I don't recall seeing that. MS. MILLER: Ms. Miller for the record. Atara Miller from Milbank. I will confirm, or I have confirmed that we have already produced the RSM materials. And I also -- just so that there is clarity, our intention is to produce documents as we get them on a periodic basis. So it's not -- you know,

we're not going to be uploading things every day, but we're imagining to do it, you know, once a week if it's slow, twice a week if things pick up.

So you have our representation, we've committed to it already, and we will continue to produce any materials that we receive.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, I'm trying to figure out,

Ms. McKeen, if there's a very targeted request of audit papers

relating to these two accounts, and in particular, the

description of these funds.

MS. MCKEEN: So I think what we just heard illustrates the problem that the government parties have had throughout this entire discovery process with what defendants are doing, which is that they say that what they want is very targeted, and they can be very narrow. And then when the Court comes up with a good idea, which is can this be limited to documents explaining the basis for this description, what you hear in response is, well, it could be that, and then these other things, and communications about these other things, and to be fair, we've also just gotten some materials that shed light on this, but we still need more.

I'm going to read what they asked KPMG for. They asked KPMG for documents and communications concerning

Treasury's accounting practices, including the use of fund accounting, GAAP, and GASB principles. I cannot imagine a

recognize that these are not all the documents that Ms. Miller wants; but I think that the discovery is limited to identifying the nature and location of the funds and the restrictions placed thereon. I think that to the extent there have been these two -- I can't remember if you're saying two or three, I think two specific funds that the defendants have identified, the audit papers which describe and/or explain the nature and content of these funds, and any restrictions placed on the monies therein, need to be produced.

And while I assume it will be subsumed therein as special attention to the description of those funds that are included in the audited statements, and I think what's going to happen when this is over is I'm going to ask everybody to submit -- see if you can work out the language together, if you can. If you submit separately, I'll come up with my own.

MS. MILLER: So, Your Honor, again, Ms. Miller for the record.

I just want to make clear that you are contemplating production of materials from the auditors beyond just the disclosure, because, as you described it, I could imagine the government cutting and pasting the disclosure and the audited financials and saying, here you go. Here is the description of the nature of the restriction.

THE COURT: No, I do $\operatorname{--}$ I am ordering the explanation

for the changes, so that would -- it may very well include e-mails. It may very well include communications. I don't know. But I think that those documents would identify the nature and location of -- instead of saying the Infrastructure Fund, I'm saying these two specific funds that have been identified by the defendants as potentially being the Infrastructure Funds.

So does that work?

2.3

MS. MILLER: I think so. The devil's in the details, but I am hopeful that we'll be able to work something consensual out in terms of scope.

THE COURT: You see, there's always that fear of letting me write it, which, you know, you never know what you end up with that way. I think that in addition, when supplemented with the additional discovery that the government has agreed to produce, I'm hearing that that's going to cover the topics that were allowed for PRIFA.

MS. MILLER: So I just want to cover some of the other -- because I don't think we covered all of the pieces.

THE COURT: I do want to talk about, just before we go into anything else specific, and this is to you,

Ms. Miller, what about a description of where was searched or input into where should be searched? How do we get to that point?

MS. MILLER: So I was going to go there next, because

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

And so given what we've already talked about providing in connection with, you know, other things, I think this idea of going back to a conversation about what somebody said in an e-mail five years ago is not targeted or efficient. THE COURT: All right. I agree that the discovery -that an e-mail search on the words "infrastructure fund" is not appropriate. I think that -- I think it would be fine in the world of unlimited discovery, where you could have all your wishes come true, but I don't think that it is the most efficient way; and we are going to run out of time and money, believe it or not, on this discovery. But I do think what the defendants will have is information as to where all this money went, came in, and the flow of the funds; and to the extent that there are -- I don't know if there need to be account opening documents or the like that would describe these accounts from when the money -- that's what I understand you're producing from PRIFAS, right? MS. MCKEEN: That is correct. THE COURT: Like the flow of all of the money? So at that point --MS. MCKEEN: Two separate things, so --THE COURT: Right, but where the money came in and where it was put, it seems to -- is what you're disclosing, or no? That information is being provided, yes. MS. MCKEEN:

```
documents Ms. Miller has described, and if we find them, they
 1
 2
     will be produced.
 3
              And to the Court's earlier comments, we will provide
     information about where we have gone to look for those things,
 4
 5
     so that folks can be satisfied that we're not just, you know,
 6
     looking in one guy's desk drawer, because that's not what's
 7
     going on.
 8
              THE COURT:
                          I do think that the audit papers, to the
 9
     extent that there were communications that explain why
10
     accounts were set up, they would be included in those.
11
     think that's a more targeting search than a general e-mail
12
     search.
              Okay.
13
                           (Nodding head up and down).
              MS. MCKEEN:
14
              THE COURT:
                          All right. So I'm going to ask you both
15
     to work together on that; but if not, just submit something
16
     separate, and I will wordsmith it.
17
              MS. MCKEEN:
                           Your Honor, when would you like the
18
     parties to submit that?
19
              THE COURT:
                          I quess you better to do it sooner rather
20
     than later, right?
21
              MS. MCKEEN:
                           It makes sense.
22
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
2.3
              MS. MCKEEN:
                           I don't see any reason we couldn't get
24
     it done by the end of the week. Obviously we want clarity.
25
              THE COURT: I mean, and I am -- I should move on, but
```